

Remarks

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on July 5, 2006, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

In the present application, claims 1, 10, 13, and 16 have been amended. The claims have been amended to clarify that the first network comprises a plurality of permanent virtual connections, that each of the permanent virtual connections has an endpoint associated with an assigned identifier, that the remote access module displays a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a plurality of source-side permanent virtual connections of a single source logical port, that the plurality of assigned identifiers are associated with a plurality of source-side permanent virtual connections that are distinct from a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a corresponding plurality of destination-side permanent virtual connections, and that provisioning a data link connection identifier includes provisioning a source identifier and a destination identifier for a new permanent virtual connection between two logical ports where both the source and the destination identifiers differ from a displayed identifier in a web page. Support for these amendments may be found in Fig. 3 and in paragraphs 0023 and 0024 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 and 9-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer et al. (US 6,490,620, hereinafter “Ditmer”) in view of Ashton et al. (US 6,181,679, hereinafter “Ashton”). Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer in view of Iwasaki (US 6,381,641) in further view of Pillai et al. (US 2002/0052950). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditmer in view of what was well known in the art.

Applicant's Statement of the Substance of the Interview

A telephonic interview between the undersigned and the Examiner was held on September 14, 2006 to discuss the rejection of independent claims 1 and 10 over the Ditmer and Ashton references. In the interview, a discussion was held with respect to proposed amendments to claims 1 and 10 to clarify that a first network comprises a plurality of permanent virtual connections, that each of the permanent virtual connections has an endpoint associated with an assigned identifier, that the remote access module displays a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a plurality of source-side permanent virtual connections of a single source logical port, that the plurality of assigned identifiers are associated with a plurality of source-side permanent virtual connections that are distinct from a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a corresponding plurality of destination-side permanent virtual connections, and that provisioning a data link connection identifier includes provisioning a source identifier and a destination identifier for a new permanent virtual connection between two logical ports where both the source and the destination identifiers differ from a displayed identifier in a web page. The Examiner agreed that the aforementioned features, if claimed, would overcome the Ditmer and Ashton references.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7 and 9-20

Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ditmer in view of Ashton and also as being unpatentable over Ditmer in view of Iwasaki and Pillai. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a system for remotely displaying network configuration information for a first network that comprises a plurality of permanent virtual

connections, wherein each of the plurality of permanent virtual connections has an endpoint associated with an assigned identifier and wherein a network management system communicates with the first network to store the assigned identifier. The system includes: a remote access module, in communication with the network management system over a network connection via a second network to obtain the assigned identifier, for remotely displaying a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a plurality of source-side permanent virtual connections of a single source logical port over an external third network to a web client, wherein the plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a plurality of source-side permanent virtual connections are distinct from a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a corresponding plurality of destination-side permanent virtual connections and wherein the network management system contains the assigned identifiers stored prior to the web client communicating for the assigned identifiers.

It is respectfully submitted that neither the combination of Ditmer and Ashton nor the combination of Ditmer, Iwasaki, and Pillai teaches, discloses, or suggests each of the features specified in amended claim 1. For example, neither of the aforementioned combinations of references discloses that the first network comprises a plurality of permanent virtual connections, that each of the permanent virtual connections has an endpoint associated with an assigned identifier, that the remote access module displays a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a plurality of source-side permanent virtual connections of a single source logical port, that the plurality of assigned identifiers are associated with a plurality of source-side permanent virtual connections that are distinct from a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a corresponding plurality of destination-side permanent virtual connections.

As discussed with the Examiner in the interview of September 14, 2006, Ditmer discusses displaying configuration information for a single PVC and its DLCI but fails to disclose displaying configuration information for a list of a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a plurality of permanent virtual connections of a port. As discussed in the Office Action, Ditmer also discusses two DLCIs assigned to a single PVC, however Ditmer fails to disclose a plurality of DLCIs assigned to a plurality of PVCs of a single source logical port, as specified in amended claim 1. Ditmer is also silent on whether the DLCIs on the source side and the destination side of a PVC are distinct (as known to those skilled in the art, a PVC may have the same source and destination DLCI).

Ashton, Iwasaki, and Pillai, also fail to disclose or suggest the aforementioned features. In the Office Action, Ashton is relied upon for allegedly disclosing a network management system containing an identifier which is stored prior to the module communicating for the identifier, Pillai is relied upon for allegedly disclosing utilizing a VPN to enable a user to access a remote module to obtain network configuration information, and Iwasaki is relied upon for allegedly disclosing a network management system that centrally stores virtual connection information and is accessible by various network modules over multiple networks and for allegedly disclosing that the network management system stores an identifier prior to a module communicating for the identifier. None of the aforementioned references, alone or in combination, however, teaches, discloses, or suggests that a first network comprises a plurality of permanent virtual connections, that each of the permanent virtual connections has an endpoint associated with an assigned identifier, that the remote access module displays a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a plurality of source-side permanent virtual connections of a single source logical port, that the plurality of assigned identifiers are associated with a plurality

of source-side permanent virtual connections that are distinct from a plurality of assigned identifiers associated with a corresponding plurality of destination-side permanent virtual connections, as specified in amended claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Dittmer and Ashton and the combination of Dittmer, Iwasaki, and Pillai fail to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-7 and 9 depend from amended independent claim 1 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Amended independent claim 10 specifies a method for provisioning a data link connection identifier in a network upon a request from a browser wherein the network comprises at least one permanent virtual connection, and wherein the virtual connection has an endpoint associated with an identifier. The method includes connecting a network management system to the first network, wherein the network management system stores the identifier prior to the request from the browser; connecting a network management module to the network management system via a second network to obtain the identifier; wherein the network management module is capable of remotely displaying the identifier over an external third network; querying the network management system with the network management module over the second network; displaying the identifier in a web page over the external third network using the network management module in response to the browser request, wherein the request contains at least one of a logical and physical port name, wherein further the web page comprises identifier information under nine column headings including at least "Source Switch", "Source Logical Port Name", "Source DLCI", "Source Service Type", "Destination Switch", "Destination

Port", "Destination DLCI", "Destination Service Type" and a "Committed Information Rate"; and provisioning a source identifier and a destination identifier for a new permanent virtual connection between two logical ports manually by a service technician, wherein both the source identifier and the destination identifier differ from the displayed identifier.

It is respectfully submitted that neither the combination of Ditmer and Ashton nor the combination of Ditmer, Iwasaki, and Pillai teaches, discloses, or suggests each of the features specified in amended claim 10. For example, neither of the aforementioned combinations of references discloses provisioning a source identifier and a destination identifier for a new permanent virtual connection between two logical ports manually by a service technician, wherein both the source identifier and the destination identifier differ from the displayed identifier. As discussed with the Examiner in the interview of September 14, 2006, Ashton discusses the manual provisioning of a unique identifier (or DLCI) for new PVC connection by providing alternate or redundant route provisioning between ports in a network. As discussed above, amended claim 10 specifies that a newly provisioned PVC has both a source identifier (source DLCI) and a destination identifier (destination DLCI) which are both different from a displayed or existing DLCI. In Ashton (see Fig. 3), the new PVC connections share at least one common source or destination DLCI with an existing PVC (for example, alternate PVCs 261 and 261 both share a common DLCI with PVC 260). Thus, there is no teaching or disclosure in Ashton of a newly provisioned PVC having both source and destination DLCIs which are not shared with the DLCIS of an existing PVC.

It is respectfully submitted that Ditmer, Iwasaki, and Pillai, also fail to disclose or suggest the aforementioned features based on the discussion of these references above. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the combination of Ditmer and Ashton and the combination of Ditmer,

Iwasaki, and Pilliai fail to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 11-12 depend from amended independent claim 10 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Amended independent claims 13 and 16 specify similar features as amended independent claim 10 and thus are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 14-15 and 17-20 depend from amended independent claims 13 and 16 respectively, and thus specify at least the same features as these claims. Therefore, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 11-20 should also be withdrawn.

Claim 8

Claim 8 is rejected as being unpatentable over Ditmer in view of what was well known in the art. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 depends from amended independent claim 1 and thus specifies at least the same features. As discussed above in the discussion of amended claim 1, Ditmer fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in this claim. The Office Action relies on what was well known in the prior art for allegedly teaching Frame Relay topologies such as mesh, partial mesh, and ring were well known network topologies. Even assuming, without conceding, this allegation to be true, claim 8 is allowable over Ditmer and what was well known in the art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after

this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

The present amendment is being filed with a petition and payment for a one-month extension of time. Please charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: October 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Alton Hornsby III/

Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(678) 565-4748